

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES - December 5, 1990

The brackets [] indicate what is believed to be a fair quote of what was said.

Topics of questions from the floor are underlined when possible.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Holst at 3:02 PM.

I. Approval and Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting of November 7, 1990 were approved as submitted.

II. Reports of Officers.

INTERIM PRESIDENT SMITH:

I do have a report for you today that I believe you will consider of some significance. It is also a bit longer than usual and at some point it may become a bit personal. So I beg your indulgence. When I accepted the position of interim president back in June, I announced publicly that I did not intend to be the caretaker or custodian in this because I did not think the university could afford that kind of interim president. I think over the past five months I have not ducked any decision that I was called upon to make. I think we have made tremendous progress over the past five months considering the circumstances of the university and the climate of the public image of the university in the months of May and June. There are a couple of things that I have tried to avoid doing. I have tried to avoid making changes or decisions that are properly the province of the next permanent president of the University of South Carolina. The obvious reason for that is that whoever he or she may be might well prefer things done in a way differently than I might propose. I have also tried not to appear to be using the office of interim president to campaign for the office of permanent president. I am going to depart somewhat from those resolutions today I think of necessity because there have been recent news articles that have changed the situation. I want to report to you today on the matters of administrative staffing, administrative salaries, and administrative costs.

Now administration bashing, as we all know, is a time honored sport in colleges and universities. As a faculty member I spent a good deal of time indulging it myself; and, in reflection, as I recall it, I enjoying those experiences. The stories in newspapers of late have gone beyond administrative bashing to the university bashing. Although they are based on information from 1989-90, those stories propagated a variety of misinformation and I believe that misinformation ought to be exposed as such. There are four aspects of this that I think should be addressed. They are aspects of the image.

- 1) That the USC administration is top heavy with vice presidents and other executives managerial staff.
- 2) That the number of administrators has grown disproportionately in recent years.
- 3) That administrators at this university are paid "outlandishly" high salaries.
- (4) that administrative costs at this university are extraordinarily high.

While these notions seem to be accepted in some circles they certainly are promoted by the media and they may well be emotionally gratifying to some of us in this room. The fact is that they do not stand up to the sort of rigorous and objective scrutiny that any of us as faculty members would insist upon in our own research. Last year I, as Provost, worked with Faculty Advisory Committee, Faculty Budget Committee, and the Self-Study Steering Committee to look at a number of these issues and I provided to the Faculty Budget Committee in particular with a number of externally generated reports that we together analyzed and reviewed at length. The Self Study Committee, if you have looked at the Self Study Report, looked at three peer institutions - UNC - Chapel Hill, Wisconsin - Madison Campus, and Pennsylvania State University. In each case the Self Study Committee concluded that our staffing patterns in administration our very similar - not identical but very similar to the staffing pattern at those peer institutions. We also looked at a number of salaries studies. One that I rely on and have for years put out annually by the University of Arkansas office of Institutional Research. It is a study of administrative salaries reported by region limited to state universities and land grant colleges across the country. The salaries of USC administrators are reported annually for that study and they are easily identifiable if you happen to know, as I do, what the salaries are and I share that information with the Faculty Budget Committee. The conclusion that the committee drew was that the salaries are comparable to those paid at comparable institutions for positions of comparable responsibility. There were also several administrative costs in general and while these are quite lengthy in detail a couple of findings are worth citing. One is so recent

that it hasn't been viewed by the Budget Committee; but, it is a finding of the State Commission on Higher Education. The Commission on Higher Education in one of its five reports issued around the first of October compared what institutions are actually spending by budget category to what the formula in effect generates for that particular category. If you want to look at the formula as in the sense prescriptive. In the area of institutional support which is a common euphemism for administration the formula suggests that we on this campus should be spending 11.3% of our budget. We actually spent 7.6%. The previous year the figures were 11.4 and 8.2. In other words we are spending a good deal less in institutional support on administration than the Commission on Higher Education funding formula suggests that we should be spending.

We also looked in the Budget Committee at a study that was prepared by the University of Tennessee - Knoxville campus based on southern regional educational board institutions - the same institutions with which we compare ourselves with faculty salaries. That study uses a somewhat different methodology than the Commission on Higher Education but the numbers are reconcilable to the same figures. That study shows that we are spending about the same amount as our SREB peers on institutional support. But it also confirmed a study that the CHE report also presents and that is we spend more on instruction and on the library than the CHE formula prescribes for the average of our SREB peers.

Finally there was one other study that we looked at in the Faculty Budget Committee that was triggered by a report in the Commission on Higher Education that gave some national figures on the expansion of administrative positions using a baseline 1975 to 1985. Those figures showed, among other things, that nationally full time faculty members had increased by 5.9% on the average whereas executives, administrative, and managerial employees had increased by nearly 18%. Again that is the national average. Now we couldn't use precisely the same data period because we did not have the data to do so but I was able to get data for the period from 1982-1989. During that seven year period at the University of South Carolina full time faculty increased by 21.2%. Executives, administrative, and managerial employees increased by 2.9%.

Now, am I saying in all this that we have no problem? The answer to that is no, I am not saying that. I am saying the situation is a good deal more complex than recent news articles or perhaps of our own preconceptions would conclude and I am certainly not advocating the need to spend any more than we are spending now on administration. Quite the contrary we need to contain - we need to hold the line on administrative costs. We need to reduce them

whenever possible and we need to reallocate the resources thereby freed to the university's primary reason for being - its academic mission. This is precisely how the current years budget was set up under my direction last June. My own priorities I hope are clear from the record. We were able to do very little that was new this year but what we did was allocate money in support of the undergraduate core curriculum and support of the Honors College and to augment the book budget of the library. But yes we do have problems. At least we have a problem that I will label title inflation. We have at the University of South Carolina several executive vice presidents and an even larger number of senior vice presidents, several system vice presidents, and alas only one plain vanilla vice president. While we have people doing jobs that are very similar to those at our peer institutions that I already mentioned ours tend to have somewhat more exalted titles. I think that is an issue that calls for attention from the next permanent president of the university.

We do have a problem with dual compensation for executives. Let me illustrate my perspective on that problem for my own experience. The State University of New York at Binghamton as senior administrator over a twelve year period I taught at least one course every year. I never sought nor did I accept any additional compensation for that teaching because I believe in people in senior executive positions (and here I would include the president, provost, all manner of vice presidents and deans) at the very least are paid 100% of salary over a full twelve month year for 100% of effort. And if they can find the time have the qualifications and are invited to teach by some academic unit it is good for them to do so. It is good for them and for the university. But they should not be paid extra.

We do have a problem with some salary supplements. This is a complicated problem. I am going to illustrate it again with a personal reference. Now when I came here in 1988 I did not come as the personal choice of James B. Holderman. The fact is he and I did not know each other and did not meet until my second recruiting visit as a candidate for the provost. I was advanced through a search committee working with the Faculty Steering Committee and, as I am told, the number one candidate. Others who were on the committee could attest to that President Holderman negotiated with me to accept the provost position. Now the state has a rule that it enforces rather rigidly that given a range of salaries for an administrative position in the executive compensation group an initial hiring is not above the midpoint range and that is the maximum that the president could offer. That salary along with the fringe benefits particularly retirement benefits they go with them totalled considerably less than I was



making at the State University of New York - Binghamton on a 9 month basis as a faculty member. In other words I would have had to take a significant cut in remuneration to come here as chief academic officer. The president then offered two salary supplements from private foundations without which I wouldn't have come. Now you would have found somebody to be the chief academic officer of the University of South Carolina - no question about it. It may not have been somebody that the search committee of the Steering Committee had recommended but somebody would have been willing to work or do the job for the salary that the state would be willing to approve without a salary supplement. So I have somewhat mixed emotions about salary supplements. I think we need that flexibility and our foundations can help us when that flexibility must be called into play. But I think that salary supplements must be resorted to only rarely after very careful study, recommended by the president, in all cases irrespective of the recipient and that in the case of senior administrators the president should seek the endorsement of the Board of Trustees Executive Committee before recommending such payment to any of the foundations that are to be done on an annual basis.

We do have a problem in administrative salaries that are about where they should be according to comparisons with SREB institutions while faculty salaries on the average are too low. They are below where they should be according to the same comparison. Now having said that certain things should be kept in perspective. Salary ranges for administrators are not determined by the University of South Carolina. They are determined by the Budget and Control Board through the State Personnel Division which some years ago conducted a management study of positions in all colleges and universities including this one and determined according to the responsibilities of each position and the going rate the market salary paid by comparable institutions what the range should be from a low to a midpoint to a high. As I said it is very difficult to make an initial appointment about the midpoint of any of those ranges. All of our administrative salaries fall within approved ranges established by the State Personnel Division which presumably is an objective outside third party. Those ranges are not determined by the University. Whenever we make an appointment the State Personnel Division must approve the salary of the individual. Comparison should also be made fairly.

Administrative salaries, as I think everyone knows, are reported on a twelve-month basis. Faculty salaries are reported on a nine-month basis. If you want to make a comparison you must either add one-third to the faculty salary or subtract one-fourth from the administrative salary in order to get a comparable monthly rate of compensation.

Now we have many high faculty salaries and we have some that are higher in fact, than the highest administrative salaries and I am not talking simply about the Medical School and the Law School. We also have far too many faculty who are compensated at levels far lower than they ought to be. We have been working on faculty salaries inequities as you know over the past three years and I think we have been making solid progress particularly for the rank of associate professor. There is also the issue of the annual raises of administrators as compared to faculty. Administrative salaries have in fact risen more rapidly in recent years than faculty salaries. Some have risen too fast. And I have begun adjusting for that fact in the raises that I approved this fall that were widely reported in the news media. In my judgement future administrative salary increases should be limited on the average to those provided to all other unclassified state employees - that is the money coming from the state. Faculty salaries on the other hand should be augmented as we have been doing the three years previous to this one whenever the university's budgetary situation permits beyond the state salary package.

Where does all this leave us? Newspapers are not the appropriate media for personnel cases to be handled whether we are talking administrators or faculty members. A number of individuals are being unfairly pilloried by the press. There are numerous examples of shoddy treatment well known to you. I do believe that the permanent president should reorganize the administration to change a number of titles reporting relationships, and position descriptions. I also believe once that reorganization is carried out the next permanent president should invite the State Personnel Division to carry out another management review of position responsibilities and salary ranges. And I believe that the next permanent president should consider dealing with issues of dual compensation, salary supplements, and annual salary increases in ways similar to those that I have described today as my own preferences.

Finally I want to say that there is a petition circulating among you seeking a freeze on administrative salaries at current levels until average faculty salaries reach those of peer institutions. Now I understand very well the frustrations that some of you feel about faculty compensation at this university. But the solution described in that petition about faculty compensation if I understand it correctly is not the way to deal with those frustrations. That solution is clearly not in the university's best interests. In all honesty I could neither support nor accept this kind of restriction. Whatever problems and imbalances we have can and should be resolved calmly and deliberately over a reasonable period of time and through our existing mechanisms for shared governance.

It has recently been suggested that a wholesale revision of administrative staff at this university is called for. I disagree very strongly. And I certainly have no intention of carrying one out if I happen to become president. Individuals whether we are discussing administrators or faculty members should be evaluated individuals on the basis of how well qualified they are and how well they do their jobs not on who originally hired them. You all would insist upon nothing less if your jobs were on the line. Our problems must be dealt with. They must be dealt with through principles of fairness and decency and not through a process that at time seems reminiscent of the uglier phases of the French Revolution. In fact we have been dealing with those issues. We have been dealing with them faculty governance process with direct participation by your representatives on the Faculty Advisory Committee and on the Faculty Welfare Committee. I think my record of working with those committees and with this Faculty Senate is well established and speaks for itself. The task ahead of us is one of continuing to heal our wounds, correcting our course, and of moving ahead with the university's mission. We have accomplished a great deal over the past 5 months to restore public confidence in the University of South Carolina. Let's get on with it together.

The president then offered to answer questions.

RUFUS FELLERS - ENGR - were you misquoted in the press concerning the remuneration of teaching in the evening school?

SMITH - yes.

FELLERS - in fact it said one either received 6.5% or \$5000 whichever was higher.

SMITH - that is incorrect. The policy that I promulgated as provost which affected the academic area of the university and I think I have a copy of that with me followed a recommendation of this body that that be set at 6 1/4% and but did not set an upper limit and this applied to faculty members on a nine month basis - take 6 1/4% on a 9 month basis when a faculty member who was otherwise eligible is teaching a normal load of courses in his or her unit. I did not as provost promulgate a policy that would apply to people not in the academic area. I learned after becoming interim president that there was a understanding with President Holderman the same 6 1/4% would apply to administrators with a ceiling of \$5,000 which ever is lesser. And that I believe was followed in 1989-90.

FELLERS- I think if you will look at three administrators and I can name them and so could you who are paid less than \$80,000 who reputedly receive \$5000. I am paid less than \$80,000 and I receive less than \$5000.

SMITH - well, Dr. Fellers, these are figures from 1989-90 and they were not at that time in my area of responsibility. And that was not such a widely announced policy.

RANDY MACK - ARTH - I think we must view this being caught in the wash of what went on. I don't think any of us intend for this but what is our feelings here represent any personal feelings about you and your watch. One of the problems I think we all have been feeling - those of us who have been here for a decade, two decades, or longer is the every widening gap between the administration and faculty and in fact a change in attitude from administration faculty of employee and management that is something that I think that has really distressed us as part of the institutional photo perspective. Another thing that bothers me in what has surfaced is the message that is sending to our students. There is a marvelous line from the movie "Wall Street" in which Michael Douglas his role as an investment shark concludes his seminar by saying "greed is good." and I am wondering if that is one of the messages that is being passed on to our students. Among the faculty I believe there is a mixed feeling - divided between one feeling of anger, which could be put to constructive use I suppose, and another feeling of cynicism. It is the cynicism that bothers me in all this. [That is,] we perceive the administration (the higher administration) to be handling things in a cynical attitude vis-a-vis ourselves. This idea of cynicism creeps down to our level and in turn is passed on to our students - doing them, I think, a terrible disservice as the university is one of the few places they really get to have constructive role models. Perhaps our feeling dissuaded in those role models. So it is not just the money (I am sure that is part of it) but it is the attitude or perception. I wonder if you could mention things that you are going to do about it. I wonder if you could address this issue of attitude and perception and end this terrible disparity that now exists mentally between our administration and the faculty. The administration which after all traditionally for 800 years of university history has come from the faculty.

SMITH - well I think you have addressed it very well Professor Mack. Coming out of the faculty is actually what in fact I have done. I still consider myself to be of the faculty in terms of my role in the institution. The president is appropriately the leader of the faculty and I would not want to see that office in any other light. I am as concerned as you are by perception and by the kind of

cynicism that was exemplified in the comment in "Wall Street". I think in the university we are called upon, perhaps more than any other institution in society, to set the right example for the young people that are our charges during their years in higher education. So again I wouldn't quarrel with the substance of what you said. What I have said today makes some prescriptions for change and they are prescriptions that I would act upon. They are prescriptions someone else may see differently and we are in a somewhat, or I am in a somewhat, unusual position because it is not a matter of a group of finalist candidates for the position of president being invited to respond to different questions. You then having the opportunity to weigh those responses one against the other. It is not clear that that opportunity will occur and I don't mean to imply criticism of any aspect of the way the presidential search is conducted. But being sensitive to the way it does appear to be conducted, I have tried not to take advantage of that. I said today, I believe it was necessary for me to speak up.

MACK - We would all enjoy the opportunity of this stage of the candidates being able to talk with them just as we have with you.

BRAD COLLINS - ART - Last year you spoke to the faculty in Humanities and Social Sciences on the issue of the what was being perceived as the inequities of various faculty salaries general level. You seemed to indicate at that time, correct me if I am wrong, but you had rather little interest addressing those inequities because you thought that the market system would be able to handle those, if the markets were interested in handling those. What I seem to see now is different attitude toward the whole question of inequities and I was wondering if you had a change of heart since you last spoke to us.

SMITH - I don't think I have had a change of heart but I am not sure that you interpreted what I said accurately from last year. It is not that I have no interest in the growing inequities among various disciplines that are caused by market circumstances quite the contrary I am deeply concerned about them. I am just not sure what we can do about them besides express concern. The fact is that certain fields are in much greater demand than other fields. If in fact we want to have an accounting or finance professor in the university, or if we want to have computer science taught, then we must be prepared to meet the salaries that people in those fields where scarcity prevails expect or are being offered by other institutions. That is what the market means. When we do that this creates felt inequities, real inequities within the university. There is not money enough available to raise the compensation levels of all of our disciplines to the



levels enjoyed by those in which the market exhibits the greatest scarcity. We all might wish that that were not the case. The fact is that it is and that creates real dilemma for all of us. It is one that we constantly tried to manage. It is what we feel in every department, every college, and certainly in the university as a whole. I do not have the solution to it but that doesn't mean that I am not sensitive to it or that I ignore it.

FAUST PAULUZZI - FORL - (Salary inequalities) I'm glad you said that because one of the situations that produces the morale problem or perhaps has even produced this air of French Revolution is this problem that the administration has not been able to solve. I find myself in the position of having to hire a person who just came out of graduate school. Who is going to probably be offered at least \$3000-\$5000 more than I am making. I have been here for 13 years, I am tenured, living in the era of enhanced teaching abilities at the University of South Carolina - I have 13 years of it. The person that I am hiring has none and I am going to have to live with it. This person is going to be able to purchase more on the market than I am able to do. This person is going to be more powerful than me, but I keep working here doing a job I love but it is going to be a frustration And it is going to be passed on my students and it is going to be passed on to you because you hear everything. Also, I hate to say this to you but I am looking to you to solve this problem. I know you are sensitive to it for two years I written you letters about it. It is an administrative problem, and it is up to the administration to solve it and I do hope you solve it well. Really the well being of everyone in this room and our colleagues ride on this.

SMITH - Well the way we have been trying to solve them in three out of the last four years on the recommendation of the Faculty Welfare Committee is to take one-third of the salary increase pool for unclassified employees set it aside to redress the long term inequities based on merit. Now we have been doing that and I think we have made progress at least some of you told me that we made some progress. We have not solved the problem even within disciplines that you are describing. We have certainly not solved the problem among disciplines, that is even more acute. This is a national problem and I think it may well grow in significance even more before a true solution to it can emerge and it comes at the worst possible time because, I don't want anybody to take this personally but the professorate is getting grayer. A number of people who were hired in the 1950's and 1960's are approaching retirement. From whence cometh their replacements - that is not clear. The people that are in the pipeline are increasingly from other countries and increasingly they return to other countries rather than staying as they might have 30 years ago in the United States. And increasingly those who stay

and Americans who do persevere through the years of graduate study to the Ph.D. degree decide not to go into university teaching and research but to go into private industry or some other field that pays better and the benefits that you and I saw in what we do - the freedom to an unparalleled degree in other professions to choose the subjects the subjects that interest us, the control that we have over time, the reward that we get from teaching, and from exploring knowledge. Those rewards are not attractive to young people today - our students. It is a very worrisome problem and I don't know aside from trying to focus attention on it and I think we all should do that - how are we going to resolve that concern. I understand my responsibility for us to strive to its solution and that believe me I will continue to do so. We have not been ignoring it and I have not simply been anguishing over it. We have made some progress.

FELLERS - ENGR - (Salary inequalities) There are really two different problems here. It appears that you simply cannot avoid the play of the marketplace that's going to happen. That is realistic. But if you take Faust's particular position when you talk about hiring a new person who is paid more than he is that is a different issue and I think one that has to be addressed more seriously and more immediately than the others which you can't really address.

SMITH - Well that is precisely the problem that I think we have been trying to address through the salary inequity pool because the market in many disciplines and increasingly now in the humanities and social sciences has been moving up more rapidly than increases in salary have been provided by universities particularly state universities where we are constrained pretty much to what state employee raise packages provided by state legislatures. And we have been dealing with it again we have been chipping away. We can't solve it all in one year any more than solve any of our problems in one year. Unfortunately we lost some ground this year because at 4 1/2% we decided to make it strictly merit - current merit and not - no we did the one third this year as well. That is the third year in a row. Next year we are going to lose the ground because it appears that there may be no salary increase provided by the state of South Carolina to any employees. And that's a very very tough news.

STAN GREEN - ANTH - (Fringe Benefits) I don't want to continue this-to make this a whining session I want to register a complaint, then offer some perhaps some constructive approach to some of the issues and that changes the salary benefits. I found out by using a little bit of simple arithmetic that my premiums have gone up 10%. I didn't realize this because in all the glossy newsletters we got and wonderful HMO fliers it didn't say anything about

premiums and nothing in any of the memos and I called the Personnel Benefits Office and they kind of calmly told me "yes depending on what you choose between 11 and 17%". I sent out a memo and got no response from anyone of value.

SMITH - I signed a response to you yesterday. The letter is in the mail; not the check.

GREEN - and that's an issue I think the university must address. I'm not placing the blame on you but on the legislature. It has been incredibly insensitive. Because I can testify personally, and I am sure I am not alone in this, the benefits quote on quote I have received have declined dramatically in absolute dollars - the premiums have gone up and there has been barely been nothing set back. There has been a lot said about salaries and we are all trying to work on issues of inequalities but nothing in regard to benefits. I register that as my complaint. On the positive side of things I am encouraged some strong leadership with regard to some of the initiatives that the Faculty Welfare Committee is pursuing. I went to a terrific meeting on the notion of family leave last week and there are some really good proposals coming in. Some of these proposals may very well get short circuited by the notion that it will take a mandate from the legislature. I would urge you not to stop let that stop the university from creating ways of developing true family benefits.

SMITH - your point is well taken. The fringe benefit package is a problem in the state of South Carolina. Often our Personnel Office doesn't find out what the state is doing until very close to the deadline. That happened this year. I think the letter that I sent out yesterday will respond to the many of the concerns that you raised. Fringe benefits package for retirement is also a problem. Particularly for those on the optional retirement program and I am one of them. There was an arbitrary reduction. A decision by the State Retirement System to reduce the state's contribution for employee retirement. Now can they legally do that? Yes. Is it appropriate, right for them to do it simply based on an actuary's recommendation? No. Now we have protested it. A number of other's have protested it and we have vigorously pursued over the past three years a legislative remedy to it. Thus far since the State Retirement System has opposed the legislative remedy we have not succeeded in getting it through by doesn't mean that we have ceased trying. Everywhere these days in the public sector and the private sector institutions, corporations are shifting more of the responsibility for health care on to the employee. The state of South Carolina is doing that which means that your coverage is not improving and the share of the total cost that you have to bear is going up. I do not like that any more than you do. That is not within the

University's control and we do our best to make our concerns known to the state authorities. But that to is a national pattern.

PETER BECKER - HIST - Mr. President, I refer to figures of something like 79% for formula funding for next year. Is that accurate at the moment? Given the possibility that it will go up or down in the future. And, secondly in the past the College of Humanities has always suffered a little bit, especially with this core program and you added money to the College this past year so that the core program could be fully funded. Is that endangered now or will the College of Humanities get the same amount of money next year or will it have to begging again.

SMITH - We are in a deepening national recession. Some states are having a much more difficult time with it then the state of South Carolina. We complain from time to time, and I have been among them, that the state is conservative fiscally in areas of bonding for capital improvements and buildings. But the conservatism of the State of South Carolina may well stand us in good stead in cushioning the effects of this recession. Several years ago the state established a capital reserve fund equal to 2% of each year's state budget. And, if revenues fall short during the year now, rather than distributing mid-year reductions to state agencies which formally was the procedure. The first recourse is to the capital reserve fund. If the capital reserve fund is adequate to absorb the short fall and revenues then no budget cuts are distributed. It appears this year, right now, based on the latest information from the Control Board that there will be no mid-year budget reductions and compared to what is happening in Virginia, New York state, Florida and a number of other states probably that you could add to that list, that is a good situation. Now remember also that in this state the legislature does not do a zero base justification of the budget every year. They take the budget that the previous year's legislature had approved as a given. They do not even look at it. They deal only with new revenues. That means that in a year when new revenues are non existent there will be no new money and that is painful because state employee raises are funded out of new revenues, budgetary increases are provided out of new revenues. And, if they are not there it is going to be a year of austerity for us. It appears next year based on projects that new revenues will be limited to something like \$66 million. The raises given this year applied only from November 16 to June 30. Next year, since you will expect level paychecks throughout the year, it will be necessary to come up with the money to annualize those increases from the period of July 1 to November 15. After that annualization takes place and other mandated costs are covered there will be no new money. So state

agencies are being told to plan for level budgets and no salary increases. Now level budgets in an inflationary economy mean a cut. A negative budget. We would have to absorb the effects of inflation in a whole variety of areas where we and your households must be economically active. If we have to do that, all I can assure you is my own position on them and that is the same way we address the budget this year. Which, frankly, wasn't a great deal better. Except for the fact that we did have employee salary increases. This year we held the line on administrative areas, non-academic administrative areas, we cut where we could, we went into a hiring freezing (you recall a year ago) in everything but faculty in order to position ourselves for a difficult year. And through reallocation, not new money, because we only got 1-1/2% increase in state appropriations and we only increased tuition and fees for in-state students by 4.58%. Barely enough combined to cover the salary annualizations left over from the previous year. Because the level of funding for the formula was dropped from above 90% to down around 87%. That was the way we approached the budget and we succeeded in reallocating enough money still do things in the academic area. That would be the general approach that I would advocate for next year. Just how much money we get depends on how the Commission on Higher Education administers the budget. Whether it applies the formula as it normally does or whether it takes what I think would be a more recent approach and that is to say alright let's save every institution harmless at its current year's appropriation. Or as close as we can get to it. And, if there is any new money distribute the new money on the basis of the formula. But stop reallocating money from students that are already in the system and where enrollments are stable or increasing slightly to those institutions where enrollments are increasing more rapidly. That has been the effect of the education formula in recent years. At this point I cannot promise you really anything that any particular action will be carried out, Peter. But that is the approach that I would advocate.

CHARLES WEASMER - GINT - (media, use of resources, 1/3 adjustment in salary for administration) Keeping in mind that Napoleon followed the French Revolution, I think it is rather inaccurate to describe the media as being engaged in university bashing. I think rather expressing the perception that the limited resources of the institution are not being used in perhaps the wisest or most effective way. You have compared the administration here to with the administration at Penn State and Chapel Hill and found the administration compares favorably. You have not made a comparison of the faculty here with the faculty at those institutions. I suspect because this would be a less than favorable at all comparison. Both Pennsylvania and North Carolina represent



larger states. Wealthier states. There are viable comparisons. The faculty has not just raised this issue recently it has very patiently and with great faith made rather modest comments from time to time and there has been no perception that any responses to these rather modest comments. The faculty has with great reluctance to assert itself with a degree of vigor and a degree of vocalness. It tends to rely with great faith and I the feeling is this faith has not always been realized. There is no assertion I believe that somehow by change in the administration funds are going to be available to solve our problems. I think there is a desire though that the administration is kept to what we need. Again it is sort of an idea "do we have the administration that we can afford" is therefore the size we need, the proper need, and not just relying upon some past inheritance. My feeling is that we have a lot of administrators and if you change their titles that does not change the situation again. Do we have individuals who are making an essential contribution to our institution? And the if the answer is yes - fine. I will leave it at that and not go into I think it is regrettable if we get into the matter of pointing fingers and naming names except that is the only way we can deal with it. To talk of supplements I think in one case it is fine to talk about this as a temporary device. I think if more and more is added to it this is to be a permanent ongoing endeavor and not just a way of redressing what maybe temporary device in terms of employment problems. We are hear quite often references to the market again the arguments tend to shift back and forth between merit and market and we are told on occasions things are done on terms of merit. And without being unduly cynical would appear to be advantageous we shift to a market argument and things cannot be done in terms of merit because it doesn't allow it. I am not quite certain where I shall come to an end. We have a reference we are going to make comparisons we have to add one third to the faculty salaries. Since the faculty I think gets paid I think 15% particularly in summer school I am not aware of where this one third is derived from.

SMITH: Well I think I responded - Charlie, I think I responded to most of the issues that you raised in my remarks. I acknowledged that administrators' salaries may have achieved the competitive level faculty salaries have not. I did not try to obscure that fact. We do have faculty members who are paid more than 15% in the summer. We have a number of them who are compensated at one third of their previous academic year salary or 30% or 33% . That is the appropriate basis of comparison at this university and on a national basis between faculty salaries and administrative salaries. I tried to acknowledge that I understand the frustration that you feel Charlie and that many others of you feel about the faculty salary situation and the slowness which we all are unhappy about

in dealing with it. And I cannot promise you any overnight solutions. Have you proposed any that would be effective in achieving that and that I think would be in the best interest of the university at all. But these are issues that we can work with together that I think we have been working together over the past several years and that we can continue.

HAL FRENCH - RELG - (summer faculty salaries vs. administrative salaries) It is not clear that the one third of the year's salary you suggest is the appropriate method [to use. If this] is comparable to what administrators get then would you be suggesting that this is what the university is striving for here for faculty salaries in the summer to approximate that. I think by far the majority of faculty salaries people who teach in the summer don't get anything approaching one third of their salaries. Are you suggesting that that is the goal that we should strive for?

SMITH - If the goal is to have everyone on a twelve month basis which many of you might want comes the millennium then perhaps that will all occur but I think the first priority is to deal with the academic year salaries. If a faculty member now paid on a 9 month basis becomes an administrator on a 12 month basis that faculty member will expect at least full annualization of salary which means adding one third. Right and probably a further increase for the administrative responsibilities. That has been past experience of moving from faculty position to administrative positions on this campus.

DON WEATHERBEE - GINT - Two very brief questions. First, [you object to] solution for petition with respect to the levels of faculty and administrator salaries and tying them together for an increase in the future. Is that because you become better administrators or because you think that some administrators might quit or some might be philosophically opposed to faculty salaries and administrative salaries being tied. Secondly, you return to the notion that there should be a very thorough reevaluation of size and structure of the administration. You said that everyone should be evaluated on their work and their competence. A number of us who have been here a long time feel that some of that work really doesn't have to be done that perhaps [some activities are not appropriate] areas of activities for a university and that perhaps an evaluation should also include not just how well they work but if that particular work is necessary. My third question is direct. I have noticed that in the catalog of the current Bulletin, Professor Holderman is in my department is tripled asterisked which says he is on leave without pay. I wonder if you could tell

us what his status is with respect to the university and whether in fact there continues to be an arrangement between Professor Holderman and the university and whether we may have to find office space for him.

SMITH - If I had known your questions were going to be so lengthy I would have taken notes but I am sure you can guide me. The last one - Dr. Holderman at the time of his resignation sought a two year leave of absence without pay because he was leaving the university going into the private sector. He wasn't going into another institution of higher education where he would have tenure and normally we would not grant a leave that would allow tenure to be held at one institution concurrently with tenure at another. That is not the case of for somebody to be going into the private sector. The Board of Trustees approved that request and Dr. Holderman is on leave without pay that expires on August 15, 1992 and he still has tenure in the University of South Carolina as a professor of government and international studies until that date. Should he choose to return-yes Don you will have to find office space for him and we will have to accommodate him as a faculty member on a basis similar to those that you have. No prior arrangement has been worked out on any details that might attend such a return. This is not an uncommon procedure. On your first question about why I would oppose apriori what I understand the petition to recommend. It strikes me, Don, brings a meat ax to bear on a problem where a skilled hand with a scalpel is called for and I doubt if you find in our school of business perhaps you would a management expert who would recommend a solution to the chief academic officer of any enterprise. A solution that makes no allowances for exceptions and that is likely to create some of the problems that you described at the very least a demoralization perhaps some departures certainly and predictably an ineffectiveness. Now maybe it is in somebody's interests to punish the administration for the fact that administrative salaries have risen more rapidly than faculty salaries. But if the administration declines in effectiveness I frankly don't see how that is going to be in your interest or the interest of the University of South Carolina and I don't think you would advocate that for any of the academic departments where for other reasons market circumstances, average salaries have also increased.

SMITH - Well, as I also in said in my initial remarks I think we have to reduce administrative costs, contain them where possible, reduce them where possible and reallocate the resources to the academic area and that is something that we should do collegially and I have no problem at all having studies conducted of staffing in various administrative components of the university. I know we all feel so I would include myself in this that somehow there are two

many administrators, that administrative jobs can be eliminated, we will not miss them. That the university will get along just fine without is a Marxian view of the super structure of the institution. I don't think that stands objective scrutiny in that proposition.

FAUST PAULUZZI - FORL - For the last 20 years I have observed university presidents change. Some people like Mason Gross at Rutgers University, who taught philosophy courses and handled the university as basically the wise philosopher king. Then once the Arab oil embargo struck this country I noticed that universities were hiring and promoting fund raisers and developers. And now I hear the word CEO. And it makes me think about what kind of president you want to be.

SMITH - Well you know I use the term CEO in making a reference to management experts in our school of business in terms of the chief executive officer of organizations or enterprises not specifically of the university's but fortunately Faust the chief executive officer is a term that is frequently applied these days toward presidents and chancellors just like chief academic officer, the financial officer and the operating officer are applied to provost and vice president for finance and executive vice president. That situation is a fact and you should not read into it any implication about my own style of administration which I think ought to be better or for worse the parent to you.

HAL FRENCH - RELG - (1/3 supplement again) I think this whole matter is perceived as inequity. You mentioned that should a faculty member become an administrator he would expect than an annualization 12 months salary plus supplements. I think some of us would be troubled to see why that necessary supplement would be one-third.

SMITH - Don't misunderstand me when I said a supplement - when a faculty member moves into administration we annualize the salary to 12 months and we can provide a salary increase which is what I meant by supplement to 10%. Okay 10% is as high as you can go without going to the Budget and Control Board for approval. I was not talking about a supplement, I should have used the term raise. I was not talking about a supplement from a foundation.

FRENCH - . . . [additional supplement] understand the category supplement when you move from faculty to administrative status alright you get the 12 month salary but why is there an assumption that an additional supplement would be deserving? This sounds like this a caste basis.

SMITH - No it's not an automatic measure. No not necessarily. The option of going to full annualization plus up to 10% that is not automatic. That is as high as we can go

without going to the Budget and Control Board. Negotiations with individuals lead to different outcomes that's all I can say. There is nothing dramatic about it.

KEITH DAVIS - PSYC - I think we are beginning to get repetitious on some of the issues. [I would like to] follow Don's comments. I think many of us are looking forward to the time instead of a meat ax we are in a position to see someone operate with that scalpel. There is a clear census that there are individuals in the university whose functions are neither clear to the faculty and whose duties are either not needed or the rationale has not been made for those particular persons and that I think is widespread belief in it. I think you heard that. We look forward to the time you or someone with your skill and intelligence can exercise this scalpel.

BRAD COLLINS - ART - . . . you have said that you are against the petition proposal because it is a meat ax, what instrument would you therefore be in favor of if it were scalpel could you be perhaps be in favor of it if the proposal were more subtle and less across the board?

SMITH - [This is what I] advocate and I began to do that this year in the way that I implemented salary increases for administrators including deans not only those in the executive compensation system but deans whom I consider to be in the same categories - administrators, executive officers of the university. I limited them to a an average of the 4 1/2% that the state provided. Now I think in future years that same group since we have achieved a competitive level and appropriate to what I consider to be a comparable level in those salaries those people as a group should be limited to whatever the state provides. But for faculty where we have not achieved on the average the kind of salary levels we want we should strive as we have done in recent years to add money to what the state provides. Now in the last three years the state has provided 4%, 4%, 4 1/2%. The first year we added 2% out of the university's operating budget for a package of 6%. The next year we did 4% on top of what the state provides. Now in each of those years administrators were also made eligible for those raises. What I described to you is a process where administrative salaries would be limited to what the state provides and augmented salary packages would be provided when the university budget allows for faculty.

BRAD COLLINS - ART - that raises the issue of percentage raises. . . . At one of the schools where I recently taught they changed the system for percentage rates which only makes more inequitable a basically inequitable system. 4% raise for someone earning \$100,000 and a 4% raise for someone earning \$30,000 quite clearly is very different as I can



tell you. What I would like to propose through my senators is that we discontinue that process and operate on a more equitable system. How do you feel about that?

SMITH - Well last year in the Faculty Welfare Committee - who is here from Faculty Welfare, Chuck, we did discuss a number of options. The president's strong preference was still for a package that was based on merit rather than one that had any across the board segments or gave a flat amount irrespective of salary level. I am not sure that the faculty is of one mind on this issue but I assure you that I am happy to work with the Faculty Welfare Committee even though next year it may be a dry year for all of us for a different way of approaching faculty compensation at the university.

CHARLES TUCKER - SOCY - [Faculty Welfare Committee will be able to report by February]

SMITH - Well, Chuck I would rather not see it in February I would rather take part in preparing it. I don't think we should deal with faculty salary issues on a we versus they situation on a management versus union or management versus employees. I think we should approach faculty salary compensation and unclassified staff compensation in general through a sheer governance approach where we meet in committee and we hash out various alternatives and then we come up with a proposal that is recommended through this body to the administration.

FELLERS - (classified employee raises) In the question of classified employees and the state provides X% increase I believe the university is required to give them that percentage raise. There is some difference depending upon their efficiency ratings but if someone has a satisfactory efficiency rating and the state salary increase is 4 1/2% you have got to give them 4 1/2% if they are classified.

SMITH - That has not been the case with unclassified employees. And I don't think you would really want it to be the case with unclassified employees.

HOLST - There is a qualifier that needs to be made with regard to what Rufus said. It is not possible in effect to give classified employee what that classified employee deserves.

SMITH - [This has happened] over the past several years until this year and there really was an inadequate supply of merit money.

HOLST - You talked about annualization is 12% which appear that department chairs are exempt from that they only get 11% they get what appears to be on the surface unpaid vacation.

SMITH - Well that has been the university procedure for a number of years that administrators and faculty in the School of Medicine are on a twelve month basis and that department chairs are moved to an eleven month basis so that they don't have to - for a number of reasons - one of them is that on an eleven month basis they don't accrue vacation per se and it doesn't give rise to a number of personnel complications that I guess Jane and her staff could develop. But that has been the university's procedure for a number of years. Now we have had some - do we have some faculty in science and math who are on a twelve month basis?

MERCER - yes.

~~SMITH - Randy, you were trying awhile ago are you still there?~~

MACK - . . . It occurs to me that in attempting to close this chasm which whether rightly or wrongly it is perceived to be ever widening which There is a difference in the way both units are judged or not judged. For faculty members the process there is a peer judgement or evaluation as we move to the tenure and promotion system and later as the committee of 24 has run its course the names of the faculty members go through administrative channels to be reviewed by provost and president and passed on to the board for final determination. There doesn't seem to be an equal process of evaluating the kind of merit performance of administrators at least involving faculty. I may be wrong in that perception but I haven't seen that. And I was wondering if some consideration this was just a thought some consideration be given in light of the other questions and perhaps changing our perception of the role of the variety of administrators allowing us to see their real function and their role and their importance in the university community to allow some kind of faculty evaluation of administrative performance.

SMITH - Well I think for certain administrators perhaps not for all of them but for certain ones more than others those whose responsibilities bring them closest to the faculty - deans, provost, president perhaps some others an evaluation process is desirable. We have done some talking about that over the past couple of years. I have talked about it with the deans as to how we would go about instituting one and as far as I'm concerned when our situation stabilizes which I hope it will do in the not to very distant future. We ought to move that consideration to the forefront and institute a procedure to achieve it.

MACK - There seems to be two different categories of administrators. You have talked about the administrator that comes out of the faculty ranks themselves. There seems to be at

this institution a large number of administrators who have not. Their functions may be very important. Their role into filling those functions may be very important but to us they seem kind of nebulous and I hate to admit but kind of suspect.

SMITH - I understand.

INA RAE HARK - ENGLISH - I think what Randy is saying is that we all remember arguing for a \$30,000 assistant professor in a desperately needed field in the previous administration, hearing there was no money and finding out that a \$75,000 special assistant to the president or press secretary to counter some scandal was being hired and that's where it has all come from and those other classes that we are beating around the bush talking about. Do you have any thoughts about people who are essential you know work for us rather [than vice versa].

SMITH - let the record show that Mr. Robinson is still with us. I'm sorry what is your last question.

HARK - [The question is about the] support staff for major senior administration members.

SMITH - I understand that and I am trying not to be repetitive in my responses but I have said we need to find ways and to contain and where possible reduce administrative costs and I am sincere in that statement. It is what I have been - I have started on it here in fact I don't believe that we should have people that are not necessary on the payroll at the University of South Carolina. But we are dealing with human beings and I don't intend to deal with human beings whether they be administrators or faculty or secretaries or maintenance employees inhumanely. That's simply the way I approach problems.

EUGENE STEPHENS - CRJU - I realize that one of the issues in the media was salary supplements but it is very clear I think to this meeting and for me for a long time that we are never going to get the kind of faculty salary we want and hope we will get if we depend strictly on the state. So what we are we doing? Private enterprise has a lot to gain to have a strong university. They have a lot more to gain than taxpayers have. And yet I don't think we call upon them I don't think enough. I don't recall a lot. How can we get more endowed chairs and more money from private enterprise? Are we trying to do that?

SMITH - absolutely.

SMITH - you know we really haven't lost momentum I think in any area of the university and that includes fund raising. We

are working very hard on fund raising for the past five months. I have been working hard on fund raising among other things. We continue to seek funding for faculty chairs and student scholarships as our major priorities and I think they are only going to grow in significance in the years ahead. We have a number of faculty chairs. Some of them are a little wobbly and I would like to see them more firmly endowed than many of them are and provide merely a salary overlay that in most cases is \$5,000. They also provide an honor that is understood in our circles to be significant. A name chair or a line of research professorship. We value the title even if it didn't come with money. Fortunately they do come with money - with some money. I would like to see us increase that. It is a major priority - it is going to be a continuing one. We need to launch a major capital campaign in this institution. Planning for that has been underway, has continued during this five month period, I think probably 1992 we have to launch a campaign for 2001. That is going to be a very ambitious campaign. We will call upon all of the university supporters in industry, the alumni to help this university achieve what it can achieve and what we want for it.

MACK - . . . I think the resolution that has been circulated and which a number of us has signed on to should be viewed not so much [as an exact solution] and endorsement of specifics of that resolution but as a way of expressing, for the first time probably as a group, our overall concern with the what I consider the drift away from full administration accountability.

SMITH - I don't take it in any other way than an expression of frustration but I would hope also that you consider the progress made over the past five months - that the drift is not away if it was in the past it is not away any longer - the drift is toward coming back together. I perceive that because I really believe we have done a lot to restore public trust and confidence irrespective of what has been reported in the press about the year 1989 -90. I think we have accomplished a lot and we must do a great deal more.

MIKE SMITH - HIST - one of the themes that have been running through all of these comments today is the gulf or a perception of a gulf in the administration and faculty is certainly something that I feel very strongly [and do the] people that I talk to [feel that strongly also]. You characterized yourself as someone who has come out of the faculty and of course that was certainly true in your experience in Binghamton. I don't think it is fair to characterization of your position here. You came in, of course, as provost. You came here after having moved very quickly out of full time faculty position into admini-



stration. In fact some might see you as a very [proto-] type of the modern professional academic administrator. . . . As others have mentioned, we have other people in the university administration who don't have any experience in the academic side. As someone mentioned, one of the things that is most galling is not so much who is appointed as senior vice president or assistant vice president but a lot of these positions are assistants to these people. I am wondering, I guess one of the reasons that we are investing so much time in talking to you about this, is that many of us believe that you are very likely to be the next president of the university so we are starting a little bit early. What would you do about bringing people out of faculty - real faculty member in to the mainstream of administration in the university not necessarily just at the level of executive senior or assistant vice president but all of the assistant roles as well. I personally feel the last person of great stature we had out of the faculty of the university is Steve Ackerman. He has retired now and I think we miss him and we miss people like him. And I am not saying anything against Ms. Forman who replaced him the point is one person coming out of the faculty of all of the large complex administration is not enough. I cannot believe given the talent we have in all colleges but the people that we have with expertise in finance, in accounting in the business school why we are not recruiting more people into the administration out of the faculty can make an enormous difference and I am wondering if at the policy you would move in that direction.

SMITH - Well Michael you have illustrated the point of which I have long been aware that is the half life of credibility of an administrator who comes out of the faculty is about 6 months. For many people if somebody moves from faculty into the administration not only has he become an SOB he has always been one. We haven't had as many faculty moving into administration as you or I might like because we haven't had as much turnover contrary to what the popular perception in the administration. But I assure you I would be happy to entertain applications because we do have affirmative action search processes and I try to uphold both the spirit and the letter of affirmative action in every hiring that we do and I would be happy to see faculty coming out for administrative positions.

COLIN BENNET - MATH - [thanks to helpful administrators] would just like to say that I was just as concerned as everyone else on the faculty about some of the issues that have discussed here but I also don't want to get into administration bashing or any segment of the administration. I hear the comments being made here about certain segments of the administration that have not come out of the faculty ranks and some broader disparaging comments about them. I would like to say for one member of



this faculty I appreciate a lot of the administrators that I deal with on a day to day basis whether or not they have come from the faculty ranks.

End of questions and answers with the interim president.

PROFESSOR PAUL HURAY (PHYSICS AND SYSTEM VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH) drew the faculty senators' attention to Appendix A, a one page summary of the Distinguished Scientist Program. He and Professor Stan Fowler (MEDC) described some of the features of the program which will obtain funding from DOE for research involving the Savannah River Site. Copies of the material have been sent to every Dean's Office so it will not be reproduced here. A series of questions and answers follow.

PROFESSOR GREENE (ANTH) - (source of matching funds) I have one general comment it is probably not surprising that I have grown critical of the sort of problem hopefully it is some constructive way of dealing with it. I was wondering happy to hear that the Savannah River site has defined these terms broadly. One of my problems with the total issue has been how exactly the university's objectives can be met, how can we meet up with the Savannah River site because I wonder if economic inversion of the Savannah River site is one of areas that distinguished scientists might need an energy expert or an economist talking about the issue of economic inversion from use of the Savannah River site as a nuclear method facility to cleaning it up and converting the jobs [other tasks]. The other issue I have is really specific. From where does the \$125,000 matching fund comes from

PROFESSOR FOWLER said that any area from medicine to economics would be appropriate. No fields of research would be considered inappropriate without a full consideration of the proposed research. Internal policy is that the matching funds would come from unfilled positions in the appropriate college and from other university sources.

ROBERT PATTERSON - HIST - Now I have some questions. I am very concerned about the donation of unfilled positions where those come from [other departments. This is] an acute problem especially in social sciences. Secondly, why make - do I understand you correctly that current faculty at the university would be ineligible why not make it simply an international search and entertain applications from wherever because it seems to me that it is discriminatory against [our own] scholars.

HURAY - Well it was the principal from which the funds were obtained that the [idea that] the current faculty or staff would not be eligible because we felt that we could assure them what we were seeking was individuals of the highest caliber outside of the area to be brought in

to identify us in a special way. That's the condition upon which the money was given us.

PATTERSON - How about the first question? What about the unfilled position?

HURAY - I think it will be up to the dean in each case probably to find funds as he sees appropriate whether it is an unfilled position [or other monies,] that's up to him.

FRANCIS GADALA-MARIA - ENGR - Are the salary ranges of the discretionary funds enough to attract world class scientists? Has been enough in other places?

HURAY AND FOWLER both indicated that the salaries were believed to be appropriate and that they were 9 month salaries with outside funding providing summer support. In response to a question from Peter Becker (HIST), they indicated that the appointees would be encouraged to teach as well as do research.

HURAY AND FOWLER answered that the university would be looking for individuals who already have very large research grants and the funding to support their research. In the case of Tennessee the average number of persons that come with such groups was 28. Some of those would also teach courses. It is our presence that the appointee and some of his support group would work with students. At Tennessee all but one of the appointees taught freshman courses.

WEASMER - it is my understanding that in time the university would assume the full cost of this and I don't think DOE is going to spend the money indefinitely. At some point we are going to have to pay the full cost of the salary and other rated items.

HURAY - well the intent is to have this be a continuing program as it is in Tennessee. Of course the federal government works on an annual basis for annual appropriations on the contracts that are written must be negotiated and approved each year but the intent to make it clear was that this be a continuing program.

WEASMER - Does that mean Professor X who is given tenure in a department deserved to be paid on this annual basis each year from DOE money?

HURAY - It is a shared program. Half the funds come from the university and half from DOE and let me say I would like to eventually see the opportunity to have the program throughout other areas that we would have distinguished professors in general perhaps a medical professor who has jointly supported not by the Department of Energy

but perhaps drug funds - a drug company or perhaps a [group] supported by IBM and in fact [this should increase the] potential for other positions to be appointed.

PAULUZZI - FORL - (distribution of overhead money) I just would like to know where the money realized by these people is going to go. I mean they are getting funded by money that the deans are going to give them.

HURAH - They would be just like all other research funds. You mean those research funds that you bring in from the outside would be allocated - they of course would have indirect costs associated with those and those would be returned and in the same way [allocated as other research overhead funds are allocated.]

### III. Reports of Committees.

A. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee had no report.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Pauluzzi:

PROFESSOR PAULUZZI reported that the change held back last month is resubmitted. The deadline for the change was petitioned through the College of Business Administration and was approved by an appropriate committee in that college. All changes were approved as submitted.

C. Curriculum and Courses Committee, Professor Berman:

PROFESSOR BERMAN made two editorial changes which are on record in the senate office.

PROFESSOR DON EDWARDS (STAT) asked why the restriction to Psyc majors was removed from PSYC 580.

No reason was given.

PROFESSOR OPAL BROWN (NURS) expressed concern over the wording of the foreign language requirement for HRTA. It was pointed out that the wording was the same as that for BA in the current bulletin. Professor Berman also said that a committee was working on the general problem of the wording for the foreign language requirement. Chairman Holst said that a report should be given to the senate by the March meeting.

PSYC 580 and PSYC 581 were referred back to committee and the remainder of the package was approved by the senate.

E. Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee, Prof. Sharp:

PROFESSOR SHARP submitted the material in Appendix E for the senate's information.

PROFESSORS WEASMER (GINT) AND MERCER (CHEM) AND SAFKO questioned whether this was a change in college standards or a change in the requirements for graduation. After some discussion the senate voted that this was a change in standards and as such did not require the approval of the senate.

F. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Tucker:

Faculty Welfare Committee will be considering family leave policy at its next meeting. Contact Professor Tucker or Professor Anders if you have suggestions.

The combination of Carol Bonnett's letter in USC Times and the FWC letter has encouraged many faculty and staff to donate to both the annual and sick leave pool. The suggestions that were received will be incorporated in future announcements.

Faculty/staff dependent scholarships in the range of \$600-\$1000 funded by the USC Educational Fund are available for students with a 3.0 GPR or sufficient ranking at admission. Priority is given to dependent children seeking undergraduate degrees, then to dependent children seeking graduate degrees, then to spouses of faculty/staff in the same priority order. Contact the Office of Student Financial Aid (Timothy S. Rice, 777-8134) and submit forms by February 1, 1991 for the fall 1991.

In the December meeting the FWC unanimously agreed to the following statement:

The FWC recommends the forming of a non-profit association called the Friends of Higher Education. Its primary purpose will be to educate the public of South Carolina about faculty concerns regarding higher education in South Carolina. To carry out this purpose the association will obtain the services of a lobbyist to be a liaison between state government and the faculty of USC and its friends.

Professor Tom Terrill and Hoyt Wheeler, who have consulted with the committee on this recommendation, have agreed to put together the papers necessary for this non-profit association and may contact some of you. If any of you would like to offer your assistance please contact either of them.

IV. Report of Secretary.

No report.

V. Unfinished Business.

None.

VI. New Business.

None.

VII. Good of the Order.

CHARLES ELLIOTT - MUSC - I would like to read the text of a resolution that has been circulated in many of the departments at the University.

Whereas the main business of the University of South Carolina is conducted by faculty who teach and engage in research and provide service to the community

and whereas faculty salaries at the University of South Carolina continue to lag behind faculty salaries at our peer institutions in the southeast

and whereas the number of administration positions above the department level at the University of South Carolina appears to be excessive

and whereas the salaries of administrators above the department level of the University of South Carolina appear to be excessive compared to faculty salaries

and whereas it is unlikely that the South Carolina General Assembly is going to provide significant additional funding for the University of South Carolina any time in the near future

Be it resolved

1. The portion of the university budget allocated to administrative officers and offices shall not be increased beyond the current 1990-91 level until such a time that faculty salaries at the University of South Carolina are on average equal to faculty salaries at our peer institutions in the southeast.



2. Average percentage raise of faculty at the University of South Carolina shall always be equal to or greater than that awarded to administrators after such a time as faculty salaries are equal to those at our peer institutions in the southeast.
3. A faculty committee shall be appointed the responsibility of which shall be to (a) make yearly determinations of the extent to which the above resolutions are being implemented, (b) conduct a comparative study of the administrative structures, budgets and salaries at our peer institutions in the southeast, and (c) make timely reports to the faculty in these matters.

As of today we have collected over 300 signatures of faculty who support this resolution. After all faculty who wish to do so have had the opportunity to endorse it it will be given to the Board of Trustees Faculty Liaison Committee for presentation to that body. If any of you wish to endorse this resolution and have not done so I have copies available. Also there are departments where the resolution have not circulated I urge those senators to get a copy from me immediately following this meeting. Signed copies should be returned as quickly as possible to either Charles Elliott in the School of Music or Charles Tucker in Sociology.

HOLST - Clarification. You intend to hand to the Faculty Board of Trustees Liaison Committee for presentation to the Board of Trustees. The Faculty Liaison Committee meets with the Academic Affairs Committee is that where you want to present it.

ELLIOTT - We would like it presented to the Board of Trustees. It is my understanding that in order to have it presented to the Board of Trustees you have to go through the Faculty Liaison Committee.

HOLST - I think I understand.

WEASMER - It appears this calls for freeze and does not call for a cut either with meat ax or scalpel. Is that a correct understanding?

HOLST - That is correct.

ROBERT PATTERSON - HIST - requested the Senate chair to have the chair of the Budget Committee at the next senate meeting to answer questions.

HOLST - will be done.

PROFESSOR SILVERNAIL (GEOG) - reminded the senators of the rules  
for the scheduling of exams during the last week of classes.

Following announcements the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 PM.

SECRET  
CONFIDENTIAL